arXiv:0909.4816v1 [math.PR] 25 Sep 2009

SCALING EXPONENT FOR THE HOPF-COLE SOLUTION OF KPZ/STOCHASTIC BURGERS

M. BALÁZS, J. QUASTEL, AND T. SEPPÄLÄINEN

Abstract. We consider the stochastic heat equation

$$\partial_t Z = \partial_x^2 Z - Z\dot{W}$$

on the real line, where $\dot{W}$ is space-time white noise. $h(t,x) = -\log Z(t,x)$ is interpreted as a solution of the KPZ equation, and $u(t,x) = \partial_x h(t,x)$ as a solution of the stochastic Burgers equation. We take $Z(0,x) = \exp\{B(x)\}$ where $B(x)$ is a two-sided Brownian motion, corresponding to the stationary solution of the stochastic Burgers equation. We show that there exist $0 < c_1 \le c_2 < \infty$ such that

$$c_1 t^{2/3} \le \mathrm{Var}(\log Z(t,x)) \le c_2 t^{2/3}.$$

Analogous results are obtained for some moments of the correlation functions of $u(t,x)$. In particular, it is shown that the excess diffusivity satisfies

$$c_1 t^{1/3} \le D(t) \le c_2 t^{1/3}.$$

The proof uses approximation by weakly asymmetric simple exclusion processes, for which we obtain the microscopic analogies of the results by coupling.

1. Introduction

1.1. Physical background.

The Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) equation [13] is a formal stochastic partial differential equation for a random function $h(t,x)$,

---

Date: September 25, 2009.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60H15, 82C22; Secondary 35R60,60K35.

Key words and phrases. Kardar-Parisi-Zhang equation, stochastic heat equation, stochastic Burgers equation, random growth, asymmetric exclusion process, anomalous fluctuations, directed polymers.

M. Balázs is supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA) grants K-60708, F-67729, by the Bolyai Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and by Morgan Stanley Mathematical Modeling Center.

J. Quastel is supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

T. Seppäläinen is supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-0701091 and by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation.

$t > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\partial_t h = -\lambda(\partial_x h)^2 + \nu\partial_x^2 h + \sigma\dot{W} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\nu > 0$ and $\sigma, \lambda \neq 0$ are fixed parameters and $\dot{W}(t,x)$ is Gaussian space-time white noise

$$E[\dot{W}(t,x)\dot{W}(s,y)] = \delta(t-s)\delta(y-x).$$

It is widely studied in physics as a model of randomly growing interfaces. The derivative $u = \partial_x h$ should satisfy the stochastic Burgers equation,

$$\partial_t u = -\lambda\partial_x u^2 + \nu\partial_x^2 u + \sigma\partial_x\dot{W}. \tag{1.2}$$

Using renormalization group methods physicists have computed the dynamic scaling exponent ([10], [13], [4])

$$z = 3/2.$$

Roughly, this means that one expects non-trivial behavior under the rescaling

$$h_\varepsilon(t,x) = \varepsilon^{1/2} h(\varepsilon^{-3/2}t, \varepsilon^{-1}x).$$

For the totally asymmetric exclusion process and the polynuclear growth models, which can be thought of as discretizations of (1.1), it is now known rigorously [9, 20] that in a weak sense,

$$\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) \simeq t^{2/3} g_{\mathrm{sc}}(t^{-2/3}(x - \mathrm{v}t)) \tag{1.3}$$

for an explicit v and scaling function g_{sc} related to the Tracy-Widom distribution. Note that these models are in some sense exactly solvable.

(1.1) and (1.2) are ill-posed because the quadratic non-linear term cannot possibly make sense for a typical realization, which, in the case of (1.1) is expected to look, in x, locally, like a Brownian motion with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$. Formally applying the Hopf-Cole transformation

$$Z(t,x) = \exp\{-\lambda\nu^{-1}h(t,x)\} \tag{1.4}$$

to (1.1) leads to the stochastic heat equation

$$\partial_t Z = \nu\partial_x^2 Z - \lambda\nu^{-1}\sigma Z\dot{W}. \tag{1.5}$$

The advantage is that (1.5) is well-posed [23]. We do not attempt to justify the manipulations leading to (1.5). We define h and $u = \partial_x h$ through (1.4). These *Hopf-Cole solutions* are expected to be the physically relevant solutions of (1.1) and (1.2).

Z can be thought of as an asymptotic model of a directed polymer. There is a Feynman-Kac formula

$$Z(t,x) = E_x^\nu[:\exp\{-\beta\int_0^t \dot{W}(s,b(s))ds\}:\, Z(0,b(t))] \tag{1.6}$$

where the expectation is over an independent Brownian motion $b(s)$, $s \geq 0$ starting at x, of variance ν, $\beta = \lambda\nu^{-1}\sigma$, and $:\exp:$ is the Wick-ordered exponential (see [18] for details). The reason we write (1.6) is to draw attention to the analogy with directed polymers, a typical model being

$$z(n,x) = E_x[\exp\{-\beta \textstyle\sum_{m=1}^{n} X(m,s_m)\}] \tag{1.7}$$

where $X(m,r)$, $m \in \{1,2,\ldots\}$, $r \in \{\ldots,-1,0,1,\ldots\}$ are independent and identically distributed random variables, and s_m is a simple random walk starting at x. Assuming reasonable decay on the tails of the X's, it is expected [14] that for any β,

$$\mathrm{Var}(\log z(n,0)) \sim cn^{2\chi} \quad \text{with} \quad \chi = 1/3. \tag{1.8}$$

Little is known rigorously. Bounds analogous to $\chi \in [3/10, 1/2]$ are obtained in [6], [15], [16], [19], and [23]. The closest results with $\chi = 1/3$ are those of [1, 12] for certain last passage percolation models, which are obtained in the $\beta \to \infty$ (zero-temperature) limit. Note the contrast with dimensions $d \geq 3$ where the polymer is known to be diffusive for small β.

1.2. **Mathematical background.** We now survey what is known rigorously about (1.1). In terms of well-posedness, the technology at the present time [21] can only handle far smoother noise terms than the white noise. An unusual type of Wick product version of the problem has been introduced [11]. But besides requiring fairly smooth noises, this does *not* have the scaling expected [8], and is therefore believed *not* to be physically relevant.

The idea in [5], which leads to what appears to be the physically relevant solution, is to smooth out the white noise in space a little, and then use the Hopf-Cole transformation and the tractability of (1.5) to remove the cutoff. As this is done, one finds one has to subtract a large constant from the equation. The resulting *Hopf-Cole solution of* (1.1) is given explicitly as the logarithm of the well-defined solution of (1.5). We now recall the details.

Let $W(t)$, $t \geq 0$, be the cylindrical Wiener process, i.e. the continuous Gaussian process taking values in $H^{-1/2-}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}) = \cap_{\alpha<-1/2} H^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$E[\langle \varphi, W(t)\rangle\langle \psi, W(s)\rangle] = \min(t,s)\langle \varphi, \psi\rangle \tag{1.9}$$

for any $\varphi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, the smooth functions with compact support in $\mathbb{R}$. Here $H^{\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha < 0$, consists of distributions f such that for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, φf is in the standard Sobolev space $H^{-\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$, i.e. the dual of $H^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ under the L^2 pairing. $H^{-\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ is the closure of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ under the norm $\int (1+|t|^{-2\alpha})|\hat{f}(t)|^2 dt$ where $\hat{f}$ denotes the Fourier transform.

The distributional time derivative $\dot{W}(t,x)$ is space-time white noise. These Sobolev spaces are the natural home, as can be seen by restricting to a finite box and writing a Fourier series for white noise, with independent and identically distributed Gaussian variables as Fourier coefficients. Note the mild abuse of notation for the sake of clarity, as we write $\dot{W}(t,x)$ even though it is a distribution on $(t,x) \in [0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ as opposed to a classical function of t and x.

Let $\mathcal{F}(t)$, $t \geq 0$, be the natural filtration, i.e. the smallest σ-field with respect to which $W(s)$ are measurable for all $0 \leq s \leq t$. Let $\mathcal{G} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be an even, non-negative function with total integral 1 and for $\kappa > 0$, $\mathcal{G}_\kappa(x) = \kappa^{-1}\mathcal{G}(\kappa^{-1}x)$. The mollified Wiener process is given by $W^\kappa(t,x) = \langle \tau_{-x}\mathcal{G}_\kappa, W(t)\rangle$ where $\tau_{-x}f(y) = f(y+x)$ is the shift operator. The distributional time derivative of $W^\kappa(t,x)$ is the Gaussian field with covariance

$$C_\kappa(x-y)\delta(t-s) = E[\dot{W}^\kappa(t,x)\dot{W}^\kappa(s,y)] \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$C_\kappa(x) = \kappa^{-1}\textstyle\int \mathcal{G}(\frac{\kappa^{-1}}{2}x - y)\mathcal{G}(-\frac{\kappa^{-1}}{2}x - y)dy, \quad C_\kappa(0) = \kappa^{-1}\|\mathcal{G}\|_2^2.$$

Assume the initial data $h(0,x)$ is a random continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that for each $p > 0$ there is an $a = a(p) < \infty$ such that

$$\textstyle\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} e^{-a|x|}E[e^{-p\,h(x)}] < \infty. \tag{1.11}$$

The mollified KPZ equation is

$$\partial_t h^\kappa = -\lambda[(\partial_x h^\kappa)^2 - C_\kappa(0)] + \nu\partial_x^2 h^\kappa + \sigma\dot{W}^\kappa. \tag{1.12}$$

The following summarizes previous results, mostly from [5].

Proposition 1.1. *Let $h(0,x)$ be a random initial continuous function satisfying (1.11) and independent of the white noise $\dot{W}$.*
1. For each $\kappa > 0$, there exists a unique continuous Markov process $h_\kappa(t)$, with probability distribution P_κ on $C([0,T], C(\mathbb{R}))$, adapted to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(t) = \sigma(h_0, W_s, s \leq t)$, $t \geq 0$, and solving (1.12).
2. The process $Z^\kappa(t,x) = \exp\{-\lambda\nu^{-1}h_\kappa(t,x)\}$ is the unique adapted (mild) solution of the Itô equation,

$$\partial_t Z^\kappa = \nu\partial_x^2 Z^\kappa + \lambda\nu^{-1}\sigma Z^\kappa\dot{W}^\kappa, \qquad Z^\kappa(0,x) = \exp\{-\lambda\nu^{-1}h(0,x)\} \tag{1.13}$$

and has the representation

$$Z^\kappa(t,x) = E_x[\exp\{-\beta\int_0^t \dot{W}^\kappa(s,b(s))ds - \frac{1}{2}C_\kappa(0)t\}Z^\kappa(0,b(t))].$$

3. $Z^\kappa(t,x) \to Z(t,x)$ almost surely, uniformly on compact sets of $[0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ where Z is the unique adapted (mild) solution of (1.5) with $Z(0,x) = \exp\{-\lambda\nu^{-1}h(0,x)\}$. Furthermore, $Z(t,x) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ almost surely [17].

4. The P_κ are tight as measures on $C([0,T],C(\mathbb{R}))$. The limit process $h(t)$ coincides with

$$h(t,x) = -\lambda^{-1}\nu \log Z(t,x). \tag{1.14}$$

5. Define

$$u = \partial_x h \tag{1.15}$$

in the sense of distributions. If we start Z with initial data $Z(0,x) = \exp\{B(x)\}$ where $B(x)$ is a two sided Brownian motion independent of W with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$, then u is stationary in both space and time. In this sense, Gaussian white noise with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$ is invariant for (1.2). Stationarity here means stationarity of $\langle \tau_x\varphi, u(t)\rangle$ for smooth functions of compact support $\varphi(x)$ where $(\tau_x\varphi)(y) = \varphi(y-x)$. The corresponding $h(t,x)$ and $Z(t,x)$ are not stationary in time with these initial data, but the increments $D_\delta h(t,x) = h(t,x+\delta) - h(t,x)$ are space and time stationary.

6. Let h be the Hopf-Cole solution of (1.1), as in (1.14). Then

$$h^\gamma(t,x) = \gamma^{-\alpha} h(\gamma^{-\beta}t, \gamma^{-1}x) \tag{1.16}$$

is the Hopf-Cole solution of (1.1) with new coefficients

$$\lambda_\gamma = \gamma^{\alpha-\beta+2}\lambda, \quad \nu_\gamma = \gamma^{-\beta+2}\nu, \quad \sigma_\gamma = \gamma^{\frac{-\beta+1-2\alpha}{2}}\sigma. \tag{1.17}$$

If we start (1.2) in equilibrium, ie. $u(0)$ is a white noise with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$, then the time reversed process $u(T-t)$, $t \in [0,T)$ is a solution of (1.2) with λ replaced by $-\lambda$, and the spatially reversed process $h(t,-x) \overset{\mathrm{dist}}{=} h(t,x)$.

Note that [5] only consider the case $\lambda = \nu = 1/2$ and $\sigma = 1$, but their proofs work in general. *6* is not stated there, but it follows readily from their methods.

The *Hopf-Cole solution* (1.14) *of KPZ* (1.1) is obtained as a limit of solutions of (1.12), i.e. after subtraction of a divergent term $C_\kappa(0)$. An important open problem is to show that a corresponding version of (1.1) with an appropriate Wick ordered nonlinearity is well-posed. We do not address this issue here. Since (1.14) is expected to be the relevant solution, we simply study it directly.

1.3. **Statement of results.** We can now state our main results about h.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $h(t,x)$ be the Hopf-Cole solution of (1.1) as in (1.14) with $Z(t,x)$ the solution of (1.5), with initial data $Z(0,x) = \exp\{B(x)\}$ where $B(x)$ is a two sided Brownian motion independent of W with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$. Let* $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$ *denote the variance of $h(t,x)$.* $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$ *is a symmetric function of x, non-decreasing in $|x|$, and*

$$\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| \geq 0. \tag{1.18}$$

Furthermore, there exist $c_0 = c_0(\sigma,\nu,\lambda) < \infty$, *and* $C_1 = C_1(\sigma,\nu,\lambda) < \infty$, $C_2 = C_2(m,\sigma,\nu,\lambda) < \infty$, *such that for* $t \ge c_0$ *we have*

$$C_1 t^{2/3} \le \mathrm{Var}(h(t,0)) \le C_2 t^{2/3} \tag{1.19}$$

and, for $1 < m < 3$,

$$C_1 t^{2m/3} \le \int |x|^{m-2} \left[\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x|\right] dx \le C_2 t^{2m/3}. \tag{1.20}$$

Remark 1.3. The dependence of the constants c_0 and C on m, σ, ν, λ is as follows: We can take

$$c_0 = \tilde c_0 \sigma^{-4}\nu^5\lambda^{-4},\ C_1 = \tilde C_1 \sigma^{\frac{2m}{3}+2}\nu^{-\frac{m}{3}-1}\lambda^{\frac{2m}{3}},\ C_2 = C(m)\sigma^{\frac{2m}{3}+2}\nu^{-\frac{m}{3}-1}\lambda^{\frac{2m}{3}}$$

for some $\tilde c_0, \tilde C_1 \in (0,\infty)$ and $C(m) = \frac{C}{m(3-m)(m-1)}$, $1 < m < 3$ and $C(1) = C/4$. Here $m = 1$ refers to (1.19). The lower bound holds for all $m \ge 1$.

Remark 1.4. Theorem 1.2 tells us that the scaling exponent for the quantities studied here follows the physical prediction, as can be seen by integrating (1.3). This provides considerable support for the notion that this process h is the sought after solution of (1.1), even though is not known presently how to show directly that $h(t,x) = -\lambda^{-1}\nu \log Z(t,x)$ solves (1.1), or indeed, what it means to solve (1.1).

Remark 1.5. Sometimes we want to indicate the dependence of the solution on the parameters by writing $h(t,x;\lambda,\nu,\sqrt{\nu})$. It is interesting to take $\lambda = 1$, $\sigma^2 = \nu$ because $h(t,x;1,\nu,\sqrt{\nu}) = \nu h(\nu^{-3}t, \nu^{-2}x; 1,1,1)$ corresponds to the solution of $\partial_t h = -(\partial_x h)^2 + \nu\partial_x^2 h + \sqrt{\nu}\dot W$ and note that the result implies that there is a $\nu_0 > 0$ and fixed $0 < c_1 \le c_2 < \infty$ such that $c_1 t^{2/3} \le \mathrm{Var}(h(t,0;1,\nu,\sqrt{\nu})) \le c_2 t^{2/3}$ for $t \ge 1$ for all $\nu \le \nu_0$.

Now we turn to results about the correlations of $u(t,x)$. Throughout we will assume that it is in equilibrium with initial data white noise with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$. By definition $\langle\varphi, u(t)\rangle = -\int \varphi'(x)h(t,x)dx$ for $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. For each fixed $t > 0$, define a bilinear functional on $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \times C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$

$$B_t(\varphi,\psi) = E[\langle\varphi, u(t)\rangle\langle\psi, u(0)\rangle].$$

The following proposition provides us with our definition of the space-time correlation measure of the stochastic Burgers equation.

Proposition 1.6. *For each* $t > 0$ *there is a unique probability measure* $S(t,dx)$ *on* $\mathbb{R}$ *such that for* $\varphi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$

$$B_t(\varphi,\psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi\Big(\frac{y+x}{2}\Big)\psi\Big(\frac{y-x}{2}\Big)\,dy\right] S(t,dx). \tag{1.21}$$

$S(t,\cdot)$ is symmetric: $S(t,A) = S(t,-A)$ for Borel sets A where $-A = \{-x : x \in A\}$. The connection with the process h is that

$$\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x)) = x + 2\int_x^\infty (z-x)\, S(t,dz) \tag{1.22}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > 0$.

The route to constructing $S(t)$ and proving (1.22) is somewhat circuitous. The measure $S(t)$ is constructed as a weak limit from the rescaled correlations of a particle process. Then we show that, in the sense of distributions,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Var}(h(t,x)) = S(t,dx). \tag{1.23}$$

Finally, after studying solutions of the stochastic heat equation, we can deduce (1.22). Here are the bounds on $S(t)$.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $u(t) = \partial_x h(t)$ be the distributional derivative of the Hopf-Cole solution* (1.14) *of* (1.1)*, in equilibrium with initial data white noise with variance $\nu^{-1}\sigma^2$ and let $S(t,dx)$ be the space-time correlation measure defined through* (1.21)*. With the same constants as in Theorem 1.2, for $t \geq c_0$ we have*

$$C_1 t^{2m/3} \leq \int |x|^m S(t,dx) \leq C_2 t^{2m/3}. \tag{1.24}$$

The upper bound holds for $1 \leq m < 3$. The lower bound holds for all $m \geq 1$. In particular, the diffusivity

$$D(t) = \frac{1}{t}\int x^2 S(t,dx) \tag{1.25}$$

satisfies

$$C_1 t^{1/3} \leq D(t) \leq C_2 t^{1/3}. \tag{1.26}$$

We turn to proofs. The first issue is to develop the connection with the exclusion process.

2. Weakly asymmetric simple exclusion

We consider nearest neighbour (i.e. simple) exclusion on $\mathbb{Z}$ (ASEP) with particles attempting jumps to the right at rate $p = 1/2$ and to the left at rate $q = 1/2 + \varepsilon^{1/2}$ with $\varepsilon \in (0,1/4)$. This is a system of continuous time random walks jumping to the right at rate p and to the left at rate q, with the rule that jumps to already occupied sites are not realized. Hence the occupation variable can be taken to be $\eta(t,x) = 1$ or 0 depending on whether or not there is a particle at $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ at time t. One of the most important properties of this system is that it preserves Bernoulli product measures with any density $\rho \in [0,1]$. Here we take $\rho = 1/2$, i.e. we take as initial configuration independent Bernoulli $\{\eta(0,x)\}$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, with density $1/2$.

Let $\hat{\eta} = 2\eta - 1$ and define the height function

$$\zeta_\varepsilon(t,x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{0<y\le x} \hat{\eta}(t,y) - 2N(t,0), & x > 0, \\ -2N(t,0), & x = 0, \\ -\sum_{x<y\le 0} \hat{\eta}(t,y) - 2N(t,0), & x < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $N(t,0)$ is the current across the bond $(0,1)$ up to time t, i.e. the number of particles that jump from 0 to 1 minus the number of particles that jump from 1 to 0 in the time interval $[0,t]$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \ge 0$ let $h_\varepsilon(t,x)$ denote the rescaled height function;

$$h_\varepsilon(t,x) = \varepsilon^{1/2}\big(\zeta_\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}t, [\varepsilon^{-1}x]) - v_\varepsilon t\big) \tag{2.2}$$

where $v_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-3/2} - \frac{1}{4!}\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ and the closest integer $[x]$ is given by

$$[x] = \lfloor x + \tfrac{1}{2} \rfloor. \tag{2.3}$$

We think of h_ε as an element of the space $D([0,\infty); D_u(\mathbb{R}))$ where D refers to right continuous paths with left limits. $D_u(\mathbb{R})$ indicates that in space these functions are equipped with the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets. Because the discontinuities of $h_\varepsilon(t,\cdot)$ are restricted to $\varepsilon(1/2+\mathbb{Z})$, it is measurable as a $D_u(\mathbb{R})$-valued random function (see Sec. 18 of [7].) Since the jumps of $h_\varepsilon(t,\cdot)$ are uniformly small, local uniform convergence works for us just as well the standard Shorohod topology. The probability distribution of the process h_ε on $D([0,\infty); D_u(\mathbb{R}))$ will be denoted $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$.

Proposition 2.1. [5] *As* $\varepsilon \searrow 0$, *the distributions* $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon$ *converge weakly to* $\mathcal{P}$, *the distribution of the Hopf-Cole solution* h (1.14) *of* (1.1) *with* $\lambda = 1/2$, $\nu = 1/2$, *and* $\sigma = 1$.

Proof. This was proved in [5] using the slightly different height function $\zeta^{\mathrm{BG}}(t,x)$ related to ours by

$$\zeta^{\mathrm{BG}}(t,x) = \zeta_\varepsilon(t,x) - 2(1 - \eta(0,0)). \tag{2.4}$$

The result follows for $\zeta_\varepsilon(t,x)$ because the difference is bounded. Note also that [5] makes the height functions continuous in space by linear interpolation and uses the smaller path space $D([0,\infty); C(\mathbb{R}))$. This makes no difference because $h_\varepsilon^{\mathrm{BG}}(t,x)$ and its continuous version are uniformly within distance $\varepsilon^{1/2}$ of each other. ∎

The rescaled velocity field is

$$u_\varepsilon(t,x) = \varepsilon^{-1/2}\hat{\eta}(\varepsilon^{-2}t, [\varepsilon^{-1}x]) \tag{2.5}$$

with $[\cdot]$ defined by (2.3). The rescaled space-time correlation functions are given by

$$S_\varepsilon(t,x) = E_\varepsilon[u_\varepsilon(t,x)u_\varepsilon(0,0)]. \tag{2.6}$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let us define a discrete Laplacian by

$$\Delta_\varepsilon f(x) = \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{-2}(f(x+\varepsilon) - 2f(x) + f(x-\varepsilon)) \tag{2.7}$$

and a discrete absolute value in terms of the closest integer function by

$$|x|_\varepsilon = |\varepsilon[\varepsilon^{-1}x]|. \tag{2.8}$$

We begin by building on some well-known properties. The assumption that density is 1/2 is used repeatedly.

Proposition 2.2. *1. For a fixed $t > 0$, $S_\varepsilon(t,x)$ is a probability density on $\mathbb{R}$ and symmetric in x except at $x \in \varepsilon(1/2+\mathbb{Z})$.*
2. $S_\varepsilon(t,x) = \Delta_\varepsilon \operatorname{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x))$. $\operatorname{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon$ is symmetric in $x \notin \varepsilon(1/2+\mathbb{Z})$, non-decreasing in $|x|_\varepsilon$, nonnegative, and for each fixed (ε,t) has exponentially decaying tails in x.
3. For $1 \le m < \infty$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|_\varepsilon^m S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta_\varepsilon(|x|_\varepsilon^m)\left[\operatorname{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon\right]dx. \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. To see that $S_\varepsilon(t,x)$ is a probability density, use the well-known connection with the second class particle:

$$S_\varepsilon(t,x) = \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon^{1/2}\{\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon^{-2}t) = [\varepsilon^{-1}x]\}. \tag{2.10}$$

Here $\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon^{1/2}$ is the coupling measure of two ASEP's that start with one discrepancy at the origin and Bernoulli(1/2) occupations elsewhere, and $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ is the position of the second class particle. This setting is discussed in Section 4. A proof of (2.10) can be found for example in [3]. Symmetry of $S_\varepsilon(t,x)$ can be seen from the definition (2.5) and the fact that

$$\widetilde{\eta}(t,k) = 1 - \eta(t,-k) \tag{2.11}$$

defines an ASEP $\widetilde{\eta}$ equal in distribution to η. See [20] for the explicit computation that proves *2*.

We now work towards *3*. Let $N(t,x)$ denote the current across the bond between site x and $x+1$ up to time t. We start by checking that

$$\operatorname{Cov}\Big[N(t,0), \sum_{y=-x+1}^{x} \eta(t,y)\Big] = 0. \tag{2.12}$$

With $\widetilde{\eta}$ as in (2.11), an $\widetilde{\eta}$-particle jump from x to y is the same as an η-hole jump from $-x$ to $-y$. Hence $\widetilde{N}(t,0) = N(t,-1)$. By the distributional equality $\widetilde{\eta} \overset{d}{=} \eta$, $\operatorname{Cov}\Big[N(t,0), \sum_{y=-x+1}^{x}\eta(t,y)\Big] = \operatorname{Cov}\Big[\widetilde{N}(t,0), \sum_{y=-x+1}^{x}\widetilde{\eta}(t,y)\Big] = \operatorname{Cov}\Big[N(t,-1), -\sum_{y=-x}^{x-1}\eta(t,y)\Big] = -\operatorname{Cov}\Big[N(t,0), \sum_{y=-x+1}^{x}\eta(t,y)\Big]$ and (2.12) is verified.

Combining Lemma 3 of [22] with (2.12) gives

$$\mathrm{Var}(\zeta_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x| = 4\,\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,0), N(t,x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.13}$$

The right-hand side of (2.13) is symmetric in x by invariance under spatial translations.

Next, note that by the finite range of ASEP, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t \geq 0$ there exist $C_1 < \infty$, $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\big|\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,0), N(t,x))\big| \leq C_1 \exp\{-C_2|x|\}. \tag{2.14}$$

(see Lemma 4 of [22] for details.)

We next argue the nonnegativity of (2.13). By symmetry it suffices to consider $x \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For $x > 0$, $v(x) = \mathrm{Var}(\zeta_\varepsilon(t,x))$ and $v(x) - |x|$ have the same discrete Laplacian. By (2.13) and (2.14) both $v(x) - |x|$ and $\Delta_1 v(x)$ decay exponentially, and, by *1* and *2*, $\Delta_1 v(x) \geq 0$. Then for $x \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$v(x) - |x| = \sum_{k=x}^{\infty}\sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} 2\Delta_1 v(\ell+1) > 0. \tag{2.15}$$

This also shows that $v(x) - |x|$ is strictly decreasing for $x \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and thereby (2.13) is strictly decreasing in $|x|$.

Putting the scaling into (2.13) gives

$$\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon = 4\varepsilon\,\mathrm{Cov}\big(N(\varepsilon^{-2}t, 0), N(\varepsilon^{-2}t, [\varepsilon^{-1}x])\big). \tag{2.16}$$

This proves (3). To prove (4), start with the observation

$$\int_{-N}^{N} |x|_\varepsilon^m \,\Delta_\varepsilon(|x|_\varepsilon)\,dx = 0.$$

Then by (2) and by integration by parts (that is, by shifting the integration variable),

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-N}^{N} |x|_\varepsilon^m S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx &= \int_{-N}^{N} |x|_\varepsilon^m \,\Delta_\varepsilon[\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon]\,dx \\ &= \int_{-N}^{N} \Delta_\varepsilon(|x|_\varepsilon^m)\,[\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon]\,dx + B_{\varepsilon,t,m}(N)\end{aligned}$$

where $B_{\varepsilon,t,m}(N)$ are sums of integrals of $|x \pm \varepsilon|_\varepsilon^m[\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon]$ over intervals of length ε around $\pm N$. By *3* these are exponentially small in N as ε, t and m are fixed. Taking $N \to \infty$ gives *4*. ∎

The key technical estimate which will be proved in Section 4 is

Theorem 2.3. *With the same constants as in Theorem 1.2, for all* $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4$, $1 \leq m < 3$, *and* $t \geq c_0$,

$$C_1 t^{2m/3} \leq \int |x|_\varepsilon^m S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx \leq C_2 t^{2m/3}. \tag{2.17}$$

Corollary 2.4. *1. For $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4$ and $t \geq c_0$,*

$$C_1 t^{2/3} \leq \mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,0)) \leq C_2 t^{2/3}. \tag{2.18}$$

2. For each $t > 0$, the family of probability measures $\{S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx\}_{0<\varepsilon<1/4}$ is tight.

Proof. Part *1* follows from Theorem 2.3 and case $m = 1$ of *4* of Proposition 2.2 because $\Delta_\varepsilon(|x|_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-1}$ for $x \in [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2)$ and vanishes elsewhere.

For $t \geq c_0$ tightness of $\{S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx\}_{0<\varepsilon<1/4}$ follows from the upper bound in (2.17). For $0 < t < c_0$ recall the second class particle connection (2.10). Proposition 4 in [22] proves that the second moment

$$\int |x|_\varepsilon^2 S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx = \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{E}\big(|\mathbf{x}(\varepsilon^{-2}t)|^2\big)$$

is monotone nondecreasing in t. Thus the large-t bound gives the tightness for all $t > 0$. ∎

3. Proofs of the main results

As a preliminary point we discuss the regularity of $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$. The control comes from the weak limit $h_\varepsilon \to h$. We have

$$\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,0)) = \int |x|_\varepsilon \, S_\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx \leq \Big(\int |x|_\varepsilon^2 \, S_\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx\Big)^{1/2}.$$

As mentioned in the proof of Corollary 2.4, this last quantity is nondecreasing in t. Consequently by the upper bound in (2.17) and the i.i.d. mean zero spatial increments of $h_\varepsilon(t,x)$ [see (2.1)] we conclude that $\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(x,t))$ is locally bounded as a function of (t,x), uniformly in $\varepsilon > 0$. By the weak limit $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) \leq \underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x))$ and so $\mathrm{Var}(h(x,t))$ is locally bounded. The x-symmetry of $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$ follows from part *6* of Proposition 1.1, or from the weak limit $h_\varepsilon \to h$ and the distributional symmetry of $\zeta_\varepsilon(t,\cdot)$. For any fixed x_0, $h(t,x) - h(t,x_0)$ is a Brownian motion in x and hence the continuity of $x \mapsto \mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$. By studying the stochastic heat equation we prove in the Appendix that

$$\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| \to 0 \quad \text{as } |x| \to \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

We turn to proving the main results.

Proof of (1.21). From the definitions we have for test functions $\varphi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned} E[\langle \varphi', h_\varepsilon(t)\rangle \langle \psi', h_\varepsilon(0)\rangle] &= E[\langle \varphi, u_\varepsilon(t)\rangle \langle \psi, u_\varepsilon(0)\rangle] + O(\varepsilon) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int \Big[\int \varphi\Big(\frac{y+x}{2}\Big)\psi\Big(\frac{y-x}{2}\Big)dy\Big] S_\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx + O(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Let $S(t,dx)$ denote a weak limit point of $S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx$ as $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Taking the limit in (3.2), the last expression becomes the right-hand side of (1.21).

Convergence of the first expectation in (3.2) to the left-hand side of (1.21) follows from the weak convergence $h_\varepsilon \to h$ with the following additional justification. Since the limit process h is continuous (in time), the pair $(h_\varepsilon(0), h_\varepsilon(t))$ converges weakly to $(h(0), h(t))$. Integration against a $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ function is a continuous function on $D_u(\mathbb{R})$. By an application of uniform integrability and Schwarz inequality, for the claimed convergence it is enough to show the L^1 boundedness of $|\langle\varphi', h_\varepsilon(t)\rangle|^4$. To see this we first transform the inner product (this is the beginning of the computation that one performs to check (3.2)):

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\varphi', h_\varepsilon(t)\rangle &= \varepsilon^{1/2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\zeta_\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{-2}t,k)\big[\varphi((k+\tfrac{1}{2})\varepsilon)-\varphi((k-\tfrac{1}{2})\varepsilon)\big]\\ &= -\,\varepsilon^{1/2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\varphi((k-\tfrac{1}{2})\varepsilon)\hat{\eta}(\varepsilon^{-2}t,k).\end{aligned}$$

(The constant term on the right-hand side of definition (2.2) vanishes since we are integrating the height function against a derivative.) This is a sum of independent mean zero random variables, and

$$E|\langle\varphi', h_\varepsilon(t)\rangle|^4 \le C\varepsilon^2\sum_k \varphi((k-\tfrac{1}{2})\varepsilon)^4 + C\varepsilon^2\sum_{k,\ell}\varphi((k-\tfrac{1}{2})\varepsilon)^2\varphi((\ell-\tfrac{1}{2})\varepsilon)^2$$

which is bounded uniformly in ε. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.7 and the upper bound of Theorem 1.2. Note first of all that from part *6* of Proposition 1.1, it suffices to prove all results with $\lambda = 1/2$, $\nu = 1/2$, $\sigma = 1$.

The upper bounds of (1.19) and (1.24) follow from the weak convergence and from the upper bounds in (2.17) and in *1* of Corollary 2.4.

Let $1 \le m < 3$. For the upper bound of (1.20) we collect these ingredients: Inequality $\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon \ge 0$ from *3* of Proposition 2.2, the fact that under the weak limit

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\big[\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x)) - |x|_\varepsilon\big] \ge \mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x|, \tag{3.3}$$

and for $x \ne 0$, $\Delta_\varepsilon(|x|_\varepsilon^m) \to m(m-1)|x|^{m-2}/2$. Combine the upper bound in (2.17) with identity (2.9), let $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ in (2.9) and use Fatou's Lemma.

To prove the lower bound of (1.24), let $t > c_0$ be fixed and choose a nonnegative smooth function $f(x)$ with compact support such that $f(x) \ge |x|^m$ for $|x| \le At^{2/3}$. We have

$$\int f(x)S(t,dx) = \lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\int f(x)S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx$$

and furthermore

$$\int f(x)S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx \geq \int_{|x|\leq At^{2/3}} |x|^m S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx.$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $m+\delta < 3$. By Chebyshev's inequality and Theorem 2.3,

$$\int_{|x|\geq At^{2/3}} |x|^m S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx \leq A^{-\delta}t^{-2\delta/3}\int |x|^{m+\delta}S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx \leq A^{-\delta}Ct^{2m/3}.$$

Hence, for appropriately chosen A,

$$\int f(x)S_\varepsilon(t,x)dx \geq (C^{-1}/2)t^{2m/3}.$$

Since this is true for all such f, we conclude that the lower bound of (1.24) holds. ∎

Proof of (1.23). We are unable to do this by direct approximation due to lack of control of moments of $h_\varepsilon(t,x)$ higher than 2. By direct calculation $E[h_\varepsilon(t,x)] = t/4!$ and we can take the $\varepsilon \searrow 0$ limit by uniform integrability that follows from the boundedness of $\mathrm{Var}(h_\varepsilon(t,x))$ argued in the beginning of this section. Consequently

$$E[h(t,x)] = t/4!. \tag{3.4}$$

From

$$\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) = E[(h(t,x)-h(0,0)-t/4!)^2]$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\delta \mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) = \delta^{-2}E[&\left(\tfrac{h(t,x+\delta)+h(t,x)}{2}-h(0,0)-t/4!\right)(h(t,x+\delta)-h(t,x))\\ &-\left(\tfrac{h(t,x)+h(t,x-\delta)}{2}-h(0,0)-t/4!\right)(h(t,x)-h(t,x-\delta))].\end{aligned}$$

Since increments are mean zero and stationary in space (part *5* of Proposition 1.1), the latter is equal to

$$\delta^{-2}E[(h(0,\delta-x)-h(0,-x))\,(h(t,\delta)-h(t,0))].$$

Define the "tent function" $\varphi_\delta(x) = (\delta^{-1}-\delta^{-2}|x|)1_{|x|\leq\delta}$. We have shown that

$$\Delta_\delta \mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) = \langle \tau_x\varphi_\delta, S(t)\rangle$$

where the angle brackets denote integration and $\tau_x\varphi_\delta(y) = \varphi_\delta(y-x)$ and we used the definition (1.21) of $S(t,dx)$. Integrating against a test function $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ gives

$$\int \Delta_\delta\psi(x)\,\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))dx = \langle \psi * \varphi_\delta, S(t)\rangle$$

with $*$ denoting convolution. Let $\delta \searrow 0$. Since $\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x))$ is locally bounded we can take the limit on the left. In the limit we obtain

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\int \partial_x^2\psi(x)\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x))dx = \langle \psi, S(t)\rangle.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 1.6. ∎

We now complete the proof of Proposition 1.6 and Theorem 1.2 with the following

Proposition 3.1. *For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > 0$,*

$$\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x)) = x + 2\int_x^\infty (z-x)\, S(t,dz). \tag{3.5}$$

This proposition implies the remaining parts of Theorem 1.2 because symmetry implies

$$\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x)) = |x| + 2\int_{|x|}^\infty (z-|x|)\, S(t,dz).$$

From this follow $\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| \geq 0$ and the identities

$$\operatorname{Var}(h(t,0)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|\, S(t,dx)$$

and for $1 < m < 3$

$$m(m-1)\int |x|^{m-2}[\operatorname{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x|]dx = 2\int |x|^m S(t,dx).$$

Then we can apply the bounds from (1.24).

Proof of Proposition 3.1. First a lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose v is a continuous, symmetric function on $\mathbb{R}$ and in the sense of distributions $v'' = 2\mu$ for a symmetric probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$. Assume that $\int_{\mathbb{R}}|x|\,d\mu < \infty$. Then*

$$v(x) = |x| + v(0) - \int_{\mathbb{R}}|z|\,\mu(dz) + 2\int_{|x|}^\infty (z-|x|)\mu(dz). \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Suppose first that $v''/2$ is a continuous probability density. Then

$$g(x) = \int_x^\infty (z-x)v''(z)\,dz$$

satisfies $g'' = v''$ and thereby

$$v(x) = ax + b + \int_x^\infty (z-x)v''(z)\,dz$$

for constants a, b. From symmetry deduce $a = 1$. Taking $x = 0$ identifies $b = v(0) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{\infty}^{\infty} |z| v''(z)\,dz$. Now (3.6) holds for smooth v. Take a symmetric compactly supported smooth approximate identity $\{\phi_\delta\}_{\delta>0}$, apply (3.6) to $\phi_\delta * v$ and let $\delta \searrow 0$. ∎

Continuing the proof of Proposition 3.1, apply (3.6) to $v(x) = \mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) = |x| &+ \left(\mathrm{Var}(h(t,0)) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|\, S(t,dz)\right)\\ &+ 2\int_{|x|}^{\infty} (z - |x|)\, S(t,dz).\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

From the Appendix we get $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| \to 0$. Combining this with above gives first

$$\mathrm{Var}(h(t,0)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|\, S(t,dz) \tag{3.8}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) &= |x| + 2\int_{|x|}^{\infty} (z - |x|)\, S(t,dz)\\ &= x + 2\int_{x}^{\infty} (z - x)\, S(t,dz). \quad ∎\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

4. Second class particle estimate

In this section we prove the key estimate for the moment of a second class particle. The context is the asymmetric simple exclusion process (ASEP) jumping to the right with rate $p = 1/2$ and to the left with rate $q = 1/2 + \varepsilon^{1/2}$. Throughout $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$, with the real interest being the limit $\varepsilon \searrow 0$. Probabilities associated to this process are denoted by P_ε^ρ when the process is stationary with Bernoulli ρ occupations. The macroscopic flux function is $H_\varepsilon(\rho) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}\rho(1-\rho)$ and the characteristic speed $V_\varepsilon^\rho = H_\varepsilon'(\rho) = -\varepsilon^{1/2}(1 - 2\rho)$.

Let $\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon^\rho$ denote the probability measure of the basic coupling of two processes $\zeta^-(t) \le \zeta(t)$ with this initial configuration: $\zeta^-(0,0) = 0 < 1 = \zeta(0,0)$, and for $x \ne 0$, $\zeta^-(0,x) = \zeta(0,x)$ have mean ρ and they are independent across the sites x. Let $\mathbf{x}(t)$ denote the position of the discrepancy between $\zeta^-(t)$ and $\zeta(t)$, in other words, the position of the second class particle started at the origin. The mean speed of the second class particle is the characteristic speed (Corollary 2.5 in [2] or Theorem 2.1 in [3]):

$$\mathbf{E}_\varepsilon^\rho[\mathbf{x}(t)] = V_\varepsilon^\rho t. \tag{4.10}$$

From (2.10), Theorem 2.3 is equivalent to the case $\rho = 1/2$ of the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *With the same constants as in Theorem 1.2, for all* $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4$, $1 \le m < 3$, *and* $t \ge c_0\varepsilon^{-2}$,

$$C_1\varepsilon^{m/3}t^{2m/3} \le \mathbf{E}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}\big[\,|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t|^m\,\big] \le C_2\varepsilon^{m/3}t^{2m/3}. \tag{4.11}$$

The remainder of the section proves Theorem 4.1, with separate subsections for the upper and lower bound.

4.1. **Proof of the upper bound for Theorem 4.1.**

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $B \in (0,\infty)$. *There exists* $C \in (0,\infty)$ *and* $c_1(B) \in (0,\infty)$ *such that the following bounds hold for all* $0 < \rho < 1$, $u \ge 1$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4$, *and* $t \ge c_1(B)\varepsilon^{-1/2}$.

(i) *For* $B\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3} \le u \le 20t/3$,

$$\mathbf{P}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t| \ge u) \le C\varepsilon t^2u^{-4}\mathbf{E}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t| + C\varepsilon t^2u^{-3} + e^{-u^2/Ct}. \tag{4.12}$$

(ii) *For* $u \ge 20t/3$,

$$\mathbf{P}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t| \ge u) \le e^{-u/C}. \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. First we obtain the bounds for $\mathbf{P}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t - u)$. By an adjustment of the constant C we can assume that u is a positive integer. Fix a density $0 < \rho < 1$ and let $\lambda \in (0,\rho)$. Consider a basic coupling of three ASEP's $\zeta \ge \zeta^- \ge \eta$ with this initial configuration:

(a) Initially $\{\zeta(0,x) : x \ne 0\}$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli(ρ) and $\zeta(0,0) = 1$.

(b) Initially $\zeta^-(0,x) = \zeta(0,x) - \delta_0(x)$.

(c) Initially $\{\eta(0,x) : x \ne 0\}$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli(λ) and $\eta(0,0) = 0$. The coupling of the initial occupations is such that $\zeta(0,x) \ge \eta(0,x)$ for all $x \ne 0$.

Recall that basic coupling means that the processes share common Poisson clocks.

Let $\mathbf{x}(t)$ be the position of the single second class particle between $\zeta(t)$ and $\zeta^-(t)$, initially at the origin. Let $\{X_i(t) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be the positions of the $\zeta - \eta$ second class particles, labeled so that initially

$$\cdots < X_{-2}(0) < X_{-1}(0) < X_0(0) = 0 < X_1(0) < X_2(0) < \cdots$$

Let these second class particles preserve their labels in the dynamics and stay ordered. Thus the $\zeta(t)$ configuration consists of first class particles (the $\eta(t)$ process) and second class particles (the $X_j(t)$'s). Let $\mathbf{P}_{\varepsilon}$ denote the joint probability distribution of these coupled processes. The marginal distribution of $(\zeta, \zeta^-, \mathbf{x})$ under $\mathbf{P}_{\varepsilon}$ is the same as under $\mathbf{P}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}$.

For $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $J^{\zeta}_x(t)$ is the net left-to-right particle current in the ζ process across the space-time line segment from point $(1/2, 0)$ to $(x+1/2, t)$. Similarly $J^{\eta}_x(t)$ in the η process, and $J^{\zeta-\eta}_x(t)$ is the net current of second class particles.

Current in the ζ process is a sum of the first class particle current and the second class particle current: $J^\zeta_x(t) = J^\eta_x(t) + J^{\zeta-\eta}_x(t)$.

Basic coupling preserves $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \{X_j(t)\}$. Define the label $m(t)$ by $\mathbf{x}(t) = X_{m(t)}(t)$ with initial value $m(0) = 0$. The label $m(t)$ performs a walk on the labels of the $\{X_j\}$ with rates p to the left and q to the right, but jumps permitted only when X_j particles are adjacent. Through a comparison with a reversible walk, Lemma 5.2 in [3] gives the bound

$$\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(m(t) \le -k) \le \exp\{-\varepsilon^{1/2}k\} \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0 \text{ and } k \ge 0. \tag{4.14}$$

To get the first step of the estimation, note that if $\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u$ and $m(t) > -k$, then $X_{-k}(t) < \lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u$. Then among the $\zeta - \eta$ particles only $X_{-k+1}, \dots, X_0$ could have crossed from the left side of $1/2$ to the right side of $\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u + 1/2$ during time $(0, t]$. Thereby $J^{\zeta-\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \le k$, and by an appeal to (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u\} &\le \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(m(t) \le -k) + \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \;-\; J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \le k)\\
&\le \exp\{-\varepsilon^{1/2}k\} + \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \;-\; J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \le k).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

We work on the second probability on line (4.15). In stationary density ρ $E^\rho_\varepsilon[J_x(t)] = H_\varepsilon(\rho)t - \rho x$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Process ζ can be coupled with a stationary density ρ process $\zeta^{(\rho)}$ with at most one discrepancy. In this coupling $|J^\zeta_x(t) - J^{\zeta^{(\rho)}}_x(t)| \le 1$ and so we can use expectations of stationary processes at the expense of small errors. Let c_1 below be a constant that absorbs the errors from using means of stationary processes and from ignoring integer parts. It satisfies $|c_1| \le 3$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_\varepsilon J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) - \mathbf{E}_\varepsilon J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) &= tH_\varepsilon(\rho) - (tH'_\varepsilon(\rho) - u)\rho - tH_\varepsilon(\lambda)\\
&\qquad + (tH'_\varepsilon(\rho) - u)\lambda + c_1\\
&= -\tfrac{1}{2}tH''_\varepsilon(\rho)(\rho-\lambda)^2 + u(\rho-\lambda) + c_1\\
&= -t\varepsilon^{1/2}(\rho-\lambda)^2 + u(\rho-\lambda) + c_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Case 1. $B\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3} \le u \le 5\rho\varepsilon^{1/2}t$. Note that $20t/3 > 5\rho\varepsilon^{1/2}t$. Choose

$$\lambda = \rho - \tfrac{1}{10}u\varepsilon^{-1/2}t^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad k = \left\lfloor \tfrac{1}{20}u^2\varepsilon^{-1/2}t^{-1}\right\rfloor - 3. \tag{4.17}$$

By assuming $t \ge C(B)\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ we guarantee that $u \ge 1$ and

$$\tfrac{1}{40}u^2\varepsilon^{-1/2}t^{-1} \ge \tfrac{1}{40}B^2\varepsilon^{1/6}t^{1/3} \ge 4.$$

Then

$$k \ge \tfrac{1}{40}u^2\varepsilon^{-1/2}t^{-1} \ge 4. \tag{4.18}$$

In the next inequality below the -3 in the definition (4.17) of k absorbs c_1 from line (4.16). Let $\overline{X} = X - EX$ denote a centered random variable. Continuing with the probability from line (4.15):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon\{J^{\zeta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t) \;-\; J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\le k\}\\
&\le \mathbf{P}_\varepsilon\Big\{\overline{J}^{\zeta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t) \;-\; \overline{J}^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\le -\tfrac{1}{25}u^2\varepsilon^{-1/2}t^{-1}\Big\}\\
&\le C\varepsilon t^2u^{-4}\mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\Big[J^{\zeta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t) \;-\; J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\Big]\\
&\le C\varepsilon t^2u^{-4}\Big(\mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\big[J^{\zeta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big] \;+\; \mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\big[J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big]\Big). \qquad (4.19)
\end{aligned}$$

C is a constant that can change from line to line but is independent of all parameters.

We develop bounds on the variances above, first for J^ζ. Utilize the coupling with a stationary density ρ process. Then apply the basic identity

$$\mathrm{Var}^\rho_\varepsilon\big[J_x(t)\big]=\rho(1-\rho)\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon\big|\mathbf{x}(t)-x\big| \qquad (4.20)$$

that links the variance of the current with the second class particle. (This is proved in Corollary 2.4 in [2] and in Theorem 2.1 in [3].) We find

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\big[J^{\zeta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big] &\le 2\,\mathrm{Var}^\rho_\varepsilon\big[J_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big]+2\\
&=2\rho(1-\rho)\mathbf{E}_\varepsilon\big|\mathbf{x}(t)-\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor+u\big|+2\\
&\le \mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t)-V^\rho_\varepsilon t|+4u. \qquad (4.21)
\end{aligned}$$

For the second variance on line (4.19) we begin in the same way:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\big[J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big] &\le 2\,\mathrm{Var}^\lambda_\varepsilon\big[J_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big]+2\\
&\le 2\lambda(1-\lambda)\mathbf{E}^\lambda_\varepsilon\big|\mathbf{x}^\lambda(t)-\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor+u\big|+2\\
&\le \mathbf{E}^\lambda_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}^\lambda(t)-V^\rho_\varepsilon t\,|+4u. \qquad (4.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we switched to a stationary density λ process and introduced a second class particle $\mathbf{x}^\lambda$ in this process. In order to get the same bound as on line (4.21) we wish to switch from $\mathbf{x}^\lambda(t)$ to the second class particle $\mathbf{x}(t)$ in the density-ρ process. To this end we utilize a coupling developed in Section 3 of [3]. Because the density ρ process has higher particle density than the density λ process, the second class particle in density λ moves on average faster in the direction of the drift. Theorem 3.1 of [3] allows us to couple $\mathbf{x}^\lambda$ and $\mathbf{x}$ so that $\mathbf{x}(t)\ge\mathbf{x}^\lambda(t)$ with probability 1. Thus continuing from line (4.22),

$$\mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\big[J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big]\le \mathbf{E}_\varepsilon\big[\mathbf{x}(t)-\mathbf{x}^\lambda(t)\big]+\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t)-V^\rho_\varepsilon t|+4u \qquad (4.23)$$

Now $\mathbf{E}_\varepsilon\big[\mathbf{x}(t)-\mathbf{x}^\lambda(t)\big]=(V^\rho_\varepsilon-V^\lambda_\varepsilon)t=2\varepsilon^{1/2}t(\rho-\lambda)$ and from the choice (4.17) of λ, $2\varepsilon^{1/2}t(\rho-\lambda)\le u$, hence

$$\mathbf{Var}_\varepsilon\big[J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor-u}(t)\big]\le \mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t)-V^\rho_\varepsilon t|+5u. \qquad (4.24)$$

Insert bounds (4.21) and (4.23) into (4.19) to get

$$\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(J^{\zeta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \;-\; J^{\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho_\varepsilon t\rfloor - u}(t) \le k) \le C\varepsilon t^2 u^{-4}\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t| + C\varepsilon t^2 u^{-3}. \tag{4.25}$$

Insert (4.18) and (4.25) into line (4.15) to get

$$\mathbf{P}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u) \le C\varepsilon t^2 u^{-4}\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t| + C\varepsilon t^2 u^{-3} + e^{-u^2/40t} \tag{4.26}$$

and we have verified (4.12) for $\mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u)$ for *Case 1.*

Case 2. $u \ge 5\rho\varepsilon^{1/2}t$. Let Z_t be a nearest-neighbor random walk with rates $p = 1/2$ to the right and $q = 1/2 + \varepsilon^{1/2}$ to the left. We have the stochastic domination $Z_t \le \mathbf{x}(t)$ because no matter what the environment next to $\mathbf{x}(t)$, it has a weaker left drift than Z_t. Then, since $V^\rho_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon^{1/2}(1-2\rho)$, $2\rho\varepsilon^{1/2}t \le 2u/5$, and $\varepsilon < 1/4$,

$$\mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon\{\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u\} \le P\{Z_t \le -\varepsilon^{1/2}t - \tfrac{3}{5}u\}. \tag{4.27}$$

For $\alpha \in (0,1]$, utilizing $(e^\alpha + e^{-\alpha})/2 \le 1 + \alpha^2$ and $e^{-\alpha} \ge 1 - \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_\varepsilon[e^{-\alpha Z_t}] &= \exp\Bigl(-(1+\varepsilon^{1/2})t + t\frac{e^\alpha + e^{-\alpha}}{2}(1 + 2\varepsilon^{1/2}) - \varepsilon^{1/2}te^{-\alpha}\Bigr)\\ &\le \exp\bigl(\alpha^2 t + (\alpha + 2\alpha^2)\varepsilon^{1/2}t\bigr).\end{aligned}$$

We can estimate $P\{Z_t \le -\varepsilon^{1/2}t - \frac{3}{5}u\} \le \exp\bigl(-\frac{3}{5}\alpha u + 2\alpha^2 t\bigr)$ and choose $\alpha = 1 \wedge \frac{3u}{20t}$ to obtain

$$\mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon\{\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u\} \le \begin{cases}\exp(-\frac{9}{200}u^2t^{-1}) & u \le 20t/3\\ \exp(-3u/10) & u > 20t/3.\end{cases} \tag{4.28}$$

Combining (4.26) and (4.28) gives Lemma 4.2 for $\mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t) \le V^\rho_\varepsilon t - u)$.

The corresponding upper tail bound $\mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t \ge u)$ is obtained from that for $\mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t \le -u)$ by a particle-hole interchange followed by a reflection of the lattice. For details we refer to Lemma 5.3 in [3]. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. ∎

Proof of the upper bound of Theorem 4.1. Integrate Lemma 4.2 to get the bound (4.11) on the moments of the second class particle. First for $m = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t| &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}^\rho_\varepsilon\{\,|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t| \ge u\}\,du\\ &\le \tfrac{1}{3}CB^{-3}\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t| + \Bigl(B + \tfrac{1}{2}CB^{-2}\Bigr)\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3}\\ &\quad + C_1(B)t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{-1/3}\exp\{-\tfrac{1}{C_1(B)}\varepsilon^{2/3}t^{1/3}\} + \tfrac{20}{3}e^{-t/C}.\end{aligned}$$

$C_1(B)$ is a new constant that depends on B. Set $B = C^{1/3}$ to obtain

$$\mathbf{E}^\rho_\varepsilon|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^\rho_\varepsilon t| \le \tfrac{9}{4}C^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3} + C_1 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{-1/3}\exp\{-\tfrac{1}{C_1}t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{2/3}\} + \tfrac{20}{3}e^{-t/C}.$$

We can fix a constant c_0 large enough so that, for a new constant C,

$$\mathbf{E}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t| \le C\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3} \quad \text{provided } t \ge c_0\varepsilon^{-2}. \tag{4.29}$$

Restrict to t that satisfy this requirement and substitute (4.29) into Lemma 4.2. Then upon using $u \ge B\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3}$ and redefining C once more, we have for $B\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3} \le u \le 20t/3$:

$$\mathbf{P}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(\,|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t| \ge u) \le C\varepsilon t^2 u^{-3} + 2e^{-u^2/Ct}. \tag{4.30}$$

Now take $1 < m < 3$ and use (4.30) together with Lemma 4.2

$$\mathbf{E}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t|^m = m\int_0^{\infty} \mathbf{P}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}\{\,|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t| \ge u\}u^{m-1}\,du \le B^m\varepsilon^{m/3}t^{2m/3}$$
$$+\ Cm\varepsilon t^2\int_{B\varepsilon^{1/3}t^{2/3}}^{\infty}(u^{m-4} + 2me^{-u^2/Ct}u^{m-1})\,du \ +\ 2m\int_{20t/3}^{\infty} e^{-u/C}u^{m-1}\,du.$$

This gives $\mathbf{E}^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}(t) - V^{\rho}_{\varepsilon}t|^m \le \frac{C}{3-m}\varepsilon^{m/3}t^{2m/3}$ provided $t \ge c_0\varepsilon^{-2}$ for a large enough c_0. ∎

4.2. **Proof of the lower bound of Theorem 4.1.** By Jensen's inequality it suffices to prove the lower bound for $m = 1$. Let C_{UB} denote the constant in the upper bound statement that we just proved. We can also assume $c_0 \ge 1$. Fix a constant $b > 0$ and set

$$a_1 = 2C_{UB} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 = 8 + \sqrt{32b} + 8\sqrt{C_{UB}}.$$

Increase b if necessary so that

$$b^2 - 2a_2 \ge 1. \tag{4.31}$$

Fix a density $\rho \in (0,1)$ and define an auxiliary density $\lambda = \rho - bt^{-1/3}\varepsilon^{-1/6}$. Define positive integers

$$u = \lfloor a_1 t^{2/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad n = \lfloor V^{\rho}t\rfloor - \lfloor V^{\lambda}t\rfloor + u. \tag{4.32}$$

By taking c_0 large enough in the statement of Theorem 4.1 we can ensure that $\lambda \in (\rho/2, \rho)$ and $u \in \mathbb{N}$.

Construct a basic coupling of three processes $\eta \le \eta^+ \le \zeta$ with the following initial state:

(a) Initially η has i.i.d. Bernoulli(λ) occupations $\{\eta(0,x) : x \ne n\}$ and $\eta(0,n) = 0$.

(b) Initially $\eta^+(0,x) = \eta(0,x) + \delta_n(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t)$ is the location of the unique discrepancy between $\eta(t)$ and $\eta^+(t)$.

(c) Initially ζ has independent occupation variables, coupled with $\eta(0)$ as follows:

(c.1) $\zeta(0,x) = \eta(0,x)$ for $0 \le x < n$ and $\zeta(0,n) = 1$.

(c.2) For $x > n$ and $x < 0$ variables $\zeta(0,x)$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli(ρ) and $\zeta(0,x) \ge \eta(0,x)$.

Let $\mathbf{P}$ denote the probability measure of the coupled processes. Label the $\zeta - \eta$ second class particles as $\{X_m(t) : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ so that initially

$$\cdots < X_{-1}(0) < 0 < X_0(0) = n = \mathbf{x}^{(n)}(0) < X_1(0) < X_2(0) < \cdots$$

Let again the random label $m(t)$ satisfy $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t) = X_{m(t)}(t)$, with initial value $m(0) = 0$. In basic coupling $m(\cdot)$ jumps to the left with rate q and to the right with rate p, but only when there is an X particle adjacent to $X_{m(\cdot)}$. As in the proof of the upper bound, Lemma 5.2 in [3] gives the bound

$$\mathbf{P}\{m(t) \geq k\} \leq \exp\{-\varepsilon^{1/2}k\} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } k \geq 0. \tag{4.33}$$

By the upper bound already proved and by the choice of a_1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t) \leq \lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor\} &= \mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t) \leq n + \lfloor V^\lambda t \rfloor - u\} \\ &\leq u^{-1}\mathbf{E}|\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t) - n - \lfloor V^\lambda t \rfloor| \leq \frac{C_{UB} t^{2/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}}{\lfloor a_1 t^{2/3}\varepsilon^{1/3} \rfloor} \leq \tfrac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

This gives a lower bound for the complementary event,

$$\tfrac{1}{2} \leq \mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t) > \lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{m(t) \geq k\} + \mathbf{P}\{J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) - J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) \geq -k\}. \tag{4.35}$$

The reasoning behind the second inequality above is as follows: $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}(t) > \lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor$ and $m(t) < k$ imply $X_k(t) > \lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor$ and consequently $-k \leq J^{\zeta-\eta}_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) = J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) - J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t)$.

Put $k = \lfloor a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} \rfloor - 2$. Observe from (4.33) that $\mathbf{P}\{m(t) \geq k\} \leq e^{-2} < 1/4$ follows from $a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} \geq 2\varepsilon^{-1/2} + 3$, which is guaranteed by $t \geq c_0\varepsilon^{-2}$ and the definition of a_2. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{4} &\leq \mathbf{P}\{J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) - J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) \geq -a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} + 2\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\{J^\zeta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) \geq -2a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} - t\varepsilon^{1/2}(2\rho\lambda - \lambda^2) + 1\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}\{J^\eta_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t) \leq -a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} - t\varepsilon^{1/2}(2\rho\lambda - \lambda^2) - 1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Consider line (4.36). The η process can be coupled with a stationary P^λ-process with at most one discrepancy. The mean current in the stationary process is

$$E^\lambda[J_{\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor}(t)] = tH(\lambda) - \lambda\lfloor V^\rho t \rfloor \geq tH(\lambda) - \lambda V^\rho t = -t\varepsilon^{1/2}(2\rho\lambda - \lambda^2).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{line (4.36)} \le P^\lambda\{J_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \le -a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} - t\varepsilon^{1/2}(2\rho\lambda-\lambda^2)\}\\
&\le P^\lambda\bigl\{\overline{J}_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \le -a_2 t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6}\bigr\} \le a_2^{-2}t^{-2/3}\varepsilon^{-1/3}\,\mathrm{Var}^\lambda\bigl[J_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t)\bigr]\\
&\le \frac{\mathbf{E}^\lambda|\mathbf{x}(t)-\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor|}{a_2^2t^{2/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}} \;\le\; \frac{\mathbf{E}^\lambda|\mathbf{x}(t)-V^\lambda t|}{a_2^2t^{2/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}} + \frac{2b}{a_2^2} + \frac{1}{a_2^2t^{2/3}\varepsilon^{1/3}}\\
&\le C_{UB}a_2^{-2} + \tfrac{1}{16} + \tfrac{1}{64} \le \tfrac{1}{8}. \qquad (4.37)
\end{aligned}$$

After Chebyshev above we applied the basic identity (4.20) for which we introduced a second class particle $\mathbf{x}(t)$ in a density λ system under the measure $\mathbf{P}^\lambda$. Then we replaced $\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor$ with $V^\lambda t$ and applied the upper bound and properties of a_2.

Put this last bound back into line (4.36) to get

$$\tfrac{1}{8} \le \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{A} = \{J_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \ge -2a_2t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} - t\varepsilon^{1/2}(2\rho\lambda-\lambda^2)+1\} \qquad (4.38)$$

Let γ denote the distribution of the initial $\zeta(0)$ configuration described by (a)–(c) in the beginning of this section. As before ν^ρ is the density ρ i.i.d. Bernoulli measure. The Radon-Nikodym derivative is

$$\frac{d\gamma}{d\nu^\rho}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\rho}\mathbf{1}\{\omega_{-n}=1\}\cdot\prod_{i=-n+1}^{0}\Bigl(\frac{\lambda}{\rho}\mathbf{1}\{\omega_i=1\} + \frac{1-\lambda}{1-\rho}\mathbf{1}\{\omega_i=0\}\Bigr).$$

Bound its second moment:

$$E^\rho\Bigl[\Bigl|\frac{d\gamma}{d\nu^\rho}\Bigr|^2\Bigr] = \frac{1}{\rho}\Bigl(1+\frac{(\rho-\lambda)^2}{\rho(1-\rho)}\Bigr)^n \le \rho^{-1}e^{n(\rho-\lambda)^2/\rho(1-\rho)} \le c_2(\rho). \qquad (4.39)$$

Here condition $t \ge c_0\varepsilon^{-2}$ implies a bound $c_2(\rho) < \infty$ independent of t and ε. From (4.38) and Schwarz's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{1}{8} \le \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A}) &= \int P^\omega(\mathcal{A})\,\gamma(d\omega)\\
&= \int P^\omega(\mathcal{A})\frac{d\gamma}{d\nu^\rho}(\omega)\,\nu^\rho(d\omega) \le c_2(\rho)^{1/2}\bigl(P^\rho(\mathcal{A})\bigr)^{1/2}. \qquad (4.40)
\end{aligned}$$

Note the stationary mean

$$E^\rho\bigl[J_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t)\bigr] = -t\varepsilon^{1/2}\rho^2 + \rho V^\rho t - \rho\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor \le -t\varepsilon^{1/2}\rho^2 + 1.$$

Continue from line (4.40), recalling (4.31):

$$\begin{aligned}(64c_2(\rho))^{-1} &\le P^\rho(\mathcal{A}) = P^\rho\{J_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \ge -2a_2t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} - t\varepsilon^{1/2}(2\rho\lambda-\lambda^2)+1\}\\ &\le P^\rho\{\,\overline{J}_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \ge -2a_2t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6} + t\varepsilon^{1/2}(\rho-\lambda)^2\}\\ &= P^\rho\{\,\overline{J}_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \ge (b^2-2a_2)t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6}\} \le P^\rho\{\,\overline{J}_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t) \ge t^{1/3}\varepsilon^{1/6}\}\\ &\le t^{-2/3}\varepsilon^{-1/3}\,\mathrm{Var}^\rho\big[J_{\lfloor V^\rho t\rfloor}(t)\big] \;\le\; t^{-2/3}\varepsilon^{-1/3}\mathbf{E}^\rho|\mathbf{x}(t)-V^\rho t|.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lower bound and thereby the proof of Theorem 4.1.

5. Appendix: Properties of the solution

Throughout this section $h(t,x) = -\log Z(t,x)$, where $Z(t,x)$ is the solution of (1.5) starting with a two sided Brownian motion $\{B(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with $B(0)=0$. The goal is to prove

$$\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| \to 0 \quad \text{as } |x|\to\infty. \tag{5.1}$$

Define the current of $u = \partial_x h$ across x up to time t by

$$N(t,x) = h(t,x) - h(0,x)$$

and the mass of u in the interval $[0,x]$ at time t by

$$M(t,x) = h(t,x) - h(t,0).$$

Proposition 5.1. $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| = \mathrm{Cov}(N(t,0),N(t,x))$.

Proof. Since $h(0,0)=0$ we have $h(t,x) = M(t,x)+N(t,0)$. From the invariance of white noise (5 of Prop 1.1), $\mathrm{Var}(M(t,x)) = |x|$. Hence

$$\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x)) - |x| = \mathrm{Var}(N(t,0)) + 2\,\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),N(t,0)). \tag{5.2}$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),N(t,0)) = -\mathrm{Var}(N(t,0)) &+ \mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),N(t,x))\\ &+ \mathrm{Cov}(N(t,x),N(t,0)).\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

To see this, note that we always have the conservation law

$$N(t,x) - N(t,0) = M(t,x) - M(0,x).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),N(t,0)) = \mathrm{Cov}&(M(t,x),N(t,x))\\ &- \mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),(M(t,x)-M(0,x))).\end{aligned}$$

But $\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),(M(t,x)-M(0,x))) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(M(t,x)-M(0,x))$. By the conservation law again $\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(M(t,x)-M(0,x)) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(N(t,x)-N(t,0))$. Finally, by the translation invariance, $\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(N(t,x)-N(t,0)) = \mathrm{Var}(N(t,0)) - \mathrm{Cov}(N(t,x),N(t,0))$. This gives (5.3).

From (5.3) we can rewrite the right hand side of (5.2) as

$$\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,x),N(t,0))+\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),N(t,0)+N(t,x)). \tag{5.4}$$

The proof is completed by noting that the second term vanishes by symmetry. To see it, note that $\mathrm{Var}(h(t,-x))=\mathrm{Var}(h(t,x))$ and by translation invariance $\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,-x),N(t,0))=\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,x),N(t,0))$. Hence $\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,x),N(t,0)+N(t,x))=\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,-x),N(t,0)+N(t,-x))$. But translating by x gives $\mathrm{Cov}(M(t,-x),N(t,0)+N(t,-x))=\mathrm{Cov}(-M(t,x),N(t,x)+N(t,0))$. ∎

Proposition 5.2. $\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,0),N(t,x))=0$.

The two propositions combine to prove (5.1).

The proof of Proposition 5.2 is based on the following lemma. We need some notation. Fix $R>0$ and let $W_1(t,x),W_2(t,x)$ be cylindrical Wiener processes and $B_1(x),B_2(x)$ two sided Brownian motions with $B_1(0)=B_2(0)=0$, coupled as follows: For any $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ supported in $(-\infty,R)$, $\langle\varphi,W_1(t)\rangle=\langle\varphi,W_2(t)\rangle$ are independent of $\int\varphi dB_1=\int\varphi dB_2$, while for any $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ supported in (R,∞), $\langle\varphi,W_1(t)\rangle$, $\langle\varphi,W_2(t)\rangle$, $\int\varphi dB_1$ and $\int\varphi dB_2$ are independent. We will say that (W_1,dB_1) and (W_2,dB_2) are the same on $(-\infty,R)$ and independent on (R,∞).

Lemma 5.3. *Let $Z_i(t,x)$, $i=1,2$, be the solutions of (1.5) with W_i, $i=1,2$ and initial data $Z_i(0,x)=\exp\{B_i(x)\}$, where (W_1,dB_1) and (W_2,dB_2) are the same on $(-\infty,R)$ and independent on (R,∞). Then there is a finite C such that for $R\geq|x|+2t$,*

$$E[(Z_1(t,x)-Z_2(t,x))^2]\leq Ce^{-R+C(t+|x|)}. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. Let $p(t,x)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}}e^{-x^2/2t}$ be the heat kernel. We can write

$$Z_i(t,x)=\int p(t,x-y)e^{B_i(y)}dy-\int\int_0^t p(t-s,x-y)Z_i(s,y)W_i(dsdy). \tag{5.6}$$

First we obtain a preliminary bound on $E[Z_i^2(t,x)]$. By Schwarz's inequality it is bounded above by (dropping the i for clarity),

$$2E[(\int p(t,x-y)e^{B(y)}dy)^2]+2E[(\int\int_0^t p(t-s,x-y)Z(s,y)W(dsdy))^2].$$

By Jensen's inequality,

$$E[(\int p(t,x-y)\exp\{B(y)\}dy)^2]\leq\int p(t,x-y)e^{2|y|}dy.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} &E[(\int\int_0^t p(t-s,x-y) Z(s,y) W(dsdy))^2] \\ &\quad = \int\int_0^t p^2(t-s,x-y) E[Z^2(s,y)] dsdy \\ &\quad \le \int\int_0^t \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(t-s)}} p(t-s,x-y) E[Z^2(s,y)] dsdy. \end{aligned}$$

Call $g(t,x) = E[Z_i^2(t,x)]$ and let P_t denote the heat semigroup. $g(0,x) = e^{2|x|}$ and have shown that

$$g(t) \le P_t g(0) + \int_0^t \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(t-s)}} P_{t-s} g(s) ds. \tag{5.7}$$

Iterating once we see that this is bounded above by

$$(1 + s\sqrt{t/\pi}) P_t g(0) + \int_0^t \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(t-s)}} P_{t-s} \int_0^s \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(s-u)}} P_{s-u} g(u) du ds. \tag{5.8}$$

The last term can be simplified by noting that $P_{t-s}P_{s-u} = P_{s-u}$, applying Fubini's theorem, and using $\int_0^s \frac{du}{\sqrt{(t-s)(s-u)}} = \pi$. The result is

$$g(t) \le (1 + s\sqrt{t/\pi}) P_t g(0) + \int_0^t P_{t-s} g(s) ds. \tag{5.9}$$

If we let $\bar{g}(0) = g(0)$ and $\bar{g}(t)$ satisfy (5.9) with equality instead of inequality, then $\bar{g} - g$ satisfies $(\bar{g} - g)(t) \ge \int_0^t P_{t-s}(\bar{g} - g)(s) ds$ with $(\bar{g} - g)(0) = 0$. By the maximum principle for the heat equation, $g \le \bar{g}$. $\bar{g}(t,x)$ is readily computed with the result that for some finite C,

$$E[Z_i^2(t,x)] = g(t,x) \le Ce^{C(t+|x|)}. \tag{5.10}$$

By (5.6) again we have $f(t,x) := E[(Z_1(t,x) - Z_2(t,x))^2]$ is bounded above by twice

$$E\Big[\Big(\textstyle\int p(t,x-y)\big(\exp\{B_1(y)\}\exp\{B_2(y)\}\big) dy\Big)^2\Big] \tag{5.11}$$

$$+E\Big[\Big(\textstyle\int\int_0^t p(t-s,x-y)\big(Z_1(s,y) W_1(dsdy) - Z_2(s,y) W_2(dsdy)\big)\Big)^2\Big]. \tag{5.12}$$

Explicit computation gives that (5.11) is equal to

$$\int_R^\infty \int_R^\infty p(t,x-y_1) p(t,x-y_2) E[(e^{B_1(y_1)} - e^{B_2(y_1)})(e^{B_1(y_2)} - e^{B_2(y_2)})] dy_1 dy_2$$

By Schwarz's inequality, (5.11) $\leq 2\int p(t,x-y)1_{\{y\geq R\}}e^{2y}dy$. Another explicit computation gives that (5.12) is equal to

$$\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^R p^2(t-s,x-y)f(s,y)dyds + 2\int_0^t\int_R^\infty p^2(t-s,x-y)E[Z_1^2(s,y)]dyds$$
$$\leq \int_0^t \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(t-s)}}\int p(t-s,x-y)(f(s,y)+1_{\{y\geq R\}}Ce^{C(s+|y|)})dyds.$$

Hence $f(t)$ satisfies the same equation as $g(t)$ in (5.9) except that this time $f(0,x)\leq 1_{\{y\geq R\}}e^{2y}$. The same argument now shows that there is a finite C such that $f(t,x)\leq Ce^{-R+C(t+|x|)}$ for $R\geq |x|+2t$. ∎

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Let us use the notation $\bar{N}(t,x)$ for the normalized current $N(t,x)-E[N(t,x)]$. First of all note that by (1.19) and 5 of Proposition 1.1, $E[\bar{N}^2(t,x)]\leq C(t)$ and does not depend on x. Now let (W_1,dB_1), (W_2,dB_2), (W_3,dB_3) be coupled so that (W_1,dB_1) and (W_2,dB_2) are the same on $(-\infty,x/2)$ and independent on $(x/2,\infty)$, (W_2,dB_2) and (W_3,dB_3) are the same on $(x/2,\infty)$ and independent on $(-\infty,x/2)$, and (W_1,dB_1) and (W_3,dB_3) are independent. Let $\bar{N}_1$, $\bar{N}_2$, $\bar{N}_3$ be the currents corresponding to the three different pairs. Of course $\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,0),N(t,x))=E[\bar{N}_1(t,0)\bar{N}_1(t,x)]$. By Schwarz's inequality

$$|E[\bar{N}_1(t,0)\bar{N}_1(t,x)]-E[\bar{N}_2(t,0)\bar{N}_1(t,x)]|\leq C|E[(\bar{N}_1(t,0)-\bar{N}_2(t,0))^2]|^{1/2} \tag{5.13}$$

and

$$|E[\bar{N}_1(t,0)\bar{N}_2(t,x)]-E[\bar{N}_1(t,0)\bar{N}_3(t,x)]|\leq C|E[(\bar{N}_2(t,x)-\bar{N}_3(t,x))^2]|^{1/2}. \tag{5.14}$$

By independence, $E[\bar{N}_1(t,0)\bar{N}_3(t,x)]=0$. By symmetry,

$$E[\bar{N}_2(t,0)\bar{N}_1(t,x)]=E[\bar{N}_1(t,0)\bar{N}_2(t,x)].$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{Cov}(N(t,0),N(t,x))\leq C(E[(h_1(t,0)-h_2(t,0))^2])^{1/2}. \tag{5.15}$$

For each $L>0$, let $\log_L z=\log z$ for $z\geq L^{-1}$ and $\log_L z=-\log L$ for $0<z<L^{-1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E[(h_1(t,0)-h_2(t,0))^2] \ &\leq\ 2E[(\log_L Z_1(t,0)-\log_L Z_2(t,0))^2] \\ &\quad +4E[1_{\{0<Z_1<L^{-1}\}}(\log Z_1(t,0))^2]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Because $\log_L$ is Lipschitz with constant L we have

$$E[(\log_L Z_1(t,0)-\log_L Z_2(t,0))^2]\leq L^2E[(Z_1(t,0)-Z_2(t,0))^2]. \tag{5.17}$$

By Lemma 5.3, for each fixed L, this vanishes as $|x|\to\infty$. On the other hand, since $E[(\log Z_1(t,0))^2]<\infty$, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}E[1_{\{0<Z_1<L^{-1}\}}(\log Z_1(t,0))^2]=0. \tag{5.18}$$

This completes the proof. ∎

References

[1] J. Baik, P. Deift, and K. Johansson. On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12:1119– 1178, 1999.

[2] M. Balázs and T. Seppäläinen. Exact connections between current fluctuations and the second class particle in a class of deposition models. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 127(2), 2007.

[3] M. Balázs and T. Seppäläinen. Fluctuation bounds for the asymmetric simple exclusion process. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 6:1–24, 2009.

[4] A.-L. Barabasi and H. E. Stanley. *Fractal concepts in surface growth.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[5] Lorenzo Bertini and Giambattista Giacomin. Stochastic Burgers and KPZ equations from particle systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 183(3):571–607, 1997.

[6] S. Bezerra, S. Tindel, and F. Viens. Superdiffusivity for a brownian polymer in a continuous gaussian environment. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(5):1642–1675, 2008.

[7] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures.* Wiley, 1968.

[8] Terence Chan. Scaling limits of Wick ordered KPZ equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 209(3):671–690, 2000.

[9] P. L. Ferrari and H. Spohn. Scaling limit for the space-time covariance of the stationary totally asymmetric simple exclusion process. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 265(1):1–44, 2006.

[10] Dieter Forster, David R. Nelson, and Michael J. Stephen. Large-distance and long-time properties of a randomly stirred fluid. *Phys. Rev. A (3)*, 16(2):732–749, 1977.

[11] H. Holden, B. Øksendal, J. Ubøe, and T. Zhang. *Stochastic partial differential equations. A modeling, white noise functional approach.* Birkhauser Boston, Boston, 1996.

[12] K. Johansson. Transversal fluctuations for increasing subsequences on the plane. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 116:445–456, 2000.

[13] K. Kardar, G. Parisi, and Y.Z. Zhang. Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 56:889–892, 1986.

[14] H. Krug and H. Spohn. *Kinetic roughenning of growing surfaces*, pages 412–525. Cambridge Univ. Press., 1991.

[15] C. Licea, C. Newman, and M. Piza. Superdiffusivity in first-passage percolation. *Prob. Th.Rel.Fields*, 106:559–591, 1996.

[16] O. Mejane. Upper bound of a volume exponent for directed polymers in a random environment. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincar'e Probab. Statist.*, 40:299–308, 2004.

[17] C. Mueller. On the support of solutions to the heat equation with noise. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 37(4):225–245, 1991.

[18] David Nualart and Boris Rozovskii. Weighted stochastic Sobolev spaces and bilinear SPDEs driven by space-time white noise. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 149(1):200–225, 1997.

[19] M. Piza. Directed polymers in a random environment: Some results on fluctuations. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 89:581–603, 1997.

[20] M. Prähofer and H. Spohn. *Current fluctuations for the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process.* Progress in Probability. Birkhauser, 2002.

[21] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[22] J. Quastel and B. Valkó. $t^{1/3}$ superdiffusivity of finite-range asymmetric exclusion processes on F. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 273(2):379–394, 2007.

[23] J. Walsh. *An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 1180 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 265–439. Springer-Verlag, 1986.

Department of Stochastics, Budapest University of Technology and Economics
E-mail address: `balazs@math.bme.hu`
URL: `www.math.bme.hu/∼balazs`

Departments of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Toronto
E-mail address: `quastel@math.toronto.edu`
URL: `www.math.toronto.edu/quastel`

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin–Madison
E-mail address: `seppalai@math.wisc.edu`
URL: `www.math.wisc.edu/∼seppalai`